

EXCERPT FROM WECHT BRIEFING TAPE #1 (recorded 8/23/72?)

Side 1, approx. 3/5 in:

Ref to back wound:

WECHT: This hole is higher up--again, as I say, I didn't bother measuring it today because the measurement ~~WASIA/ANVEX/DEEN~~ wouldn't have meant anything, but it's certainly not 5 1/2 inches below shoulder level. On the other hand it is not as high as is depicted on the sketches made by that Rydberg. I also saw those three sketches made by Rydberg, the big sketches, and I dictated notes on those. He's got the goddam thing way off the (mark?). It is not there. It's down--it's below the level of the shoulder but it's not 5 1/2 inches. It could be 5 1/2 cms.

Side 2, approx. 2/5 in:

WECHT: The hole in the back, as I told you, I would estimate to be maybe two inches below the crest of the shoulder.

Q: What about the level of the third thoracic vertebra in the back....(unintelligible)....reasonable approximation?

WECHT: Actually it would come in about the third thoracic vertebra. You know, people think...you know, the ~~THIR~~ thoracic vertebra come up pretty high. The rib already started (unintelligible word) there. So the great anxiety of that Harold Weisberg particularly has about, you know, that document, really is no big problem. It might be off by a vertebra but it's nothing. I don't know where he thought the third thoracic vertebra is located but it's not far down.

Q: So you're saying the ~~back~~ hole could be quite consistent with Burkley's description of about the third thoracic vertebra?

WECHT: Yes, right.

Approx 1 in:

WECHT: There are several possibilities. If it was higher it could have come in down over the top of the first rib and the clavicle or it could have gone in through the inter-(clavical?) space. Remember they didn't dissect this area out. We can't really be sure.

Q: So right now, in terms of any kind of (competence within reason?) Burkley's description could be right or wrong?

WECHT: Well, I think he's a little low. I think he's low. I think he's low.